DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 436 595 UD 033 196

AUTHOR	Crowson, Robert L.; Boyd, William Lowe
TITLE	New Roles for Community Services in Educational Reform. Publication Series No. 5.
INSTITUTION	Mid-Atlantic Lab. for Student Success, Philadelphia, PA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1999-00-00
NOTE	25p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Ancillary School Services; *Community Services; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Neighborhood Improvement; Nontraditional Education; *Partnerships in Education; *School Role; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS	*Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

The rediscovery of a role in extending social organization and bringing "order" to distressed neighborhoods has become an educational reform motif in the United States. A full-service school that links education and other support services can contribute to the social capital needed to improve children's learning. While it is a laudable concept, the full-service school is in conflict with many 20th century traditions, such as bureaucratization, professional distancing, fragmented and categorical programming, and only weak partnerships among educators and families and communities. The results of coordinated children's service initiatives in the United States have been mixed, with evidence that the changes promised by the concept of full-service schooling threatens many institutionalized features of U.S. schooling. Even more demanding is the idea that the schools should now play an active role in the revitalization of their communities. The added issues addressed in a transition toward "enterprise" schools performing this reform function are major. To accomplish these goals will take a serious rethinking of school, community, and family connections. The issue comes down to a question of how to join aspects of the two competing strategies, professional coordinated services and community development and empowerment, into workable approaches for schools in partnership with parents, community organizations, and other agencies. The best answer is to encourage experimentation to explore the potential of enterprise schools and alternative strategies to the joining of the two strategies. (Contains 59 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 436 595

New Roles for Community Services in Educational Reform

by
Robert L. Crowson and William Lowe Boyd

1999
Publication Series No. 5

This report is disseminated in part by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) of the U.S. Department of Education through a grant to the Laboratory for Student Success (LSS) at the Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education (CRHDE). The opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the position of the supporting agencies, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

BD033196

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Introduction

At the turn of the century in Chicago, people of some twenty-six nationalities lived within three blocks of Jane Addams' famous west side "settlement," Hull-House. The teeming slums surrounding Hull-House, filled to overflowing with newly arrived immigrants, encased as much misery as human living conditions could engender in early twentieth-century America. Addams and her partner, Ellen Gates Starr, were determined to play an active role in extending "social organization" and bringing "order" to the chaos of these slums (Philpott, 1978: 70).

Accordingly, Hull-House established nurseries, day-care centers, free medical clinics, a pure-milk station, a bathhouse, an employment bureau, a cooperative coal yard, a gym, libraries and reading rooms, men's and women's clubs, a children's playground, and "classes" by the score for neighborhood children and their parents (Philpott, 1978). It was a remarkable and courageous step, for its time, in the notion of applying middle-class guidance and resources towards a development of self-help powers among the urban poor.

Many decades later, in 1968, a notable historical event in public education accompanied the use of *power* by the urban poor. A pathbreaking experiment (a "demonstration" project) in school decentralization and community-control gave New York City's Ocean Hill-Brownsville neighborhood its own governing board. In the spring of 1968, this board decided to dismiss a substantial group of headquarters-appointed teachers and administrators—replacing them with hires of their own. A resulting New York teachers' strike went citywide, while the Ocean Hill schools struggled to remain open. Eventually, with state legislative intervention, the strike was settled, and New York's "demonstration" in community-control came to an end. In an analysis of the event, LaNoue and Smith (1973: 175) concluded that the demonstration "created potent symbols—among the most polarizing in the city's history."

Developments in the past decade have increasingly brought to the fore these two contrasting strands of community regeneration: coordinated professional services and community development or

empowerment. Disturbing social trends have led to the widespread recognition that relationships between schools and their surrounding communities must be strengthened—and that, indeed, communities themselves must be strengthened. Good schooling and the development of children require attention to multiple needs far beyond the narrowly educational; furthermore, many families now require an active investment by society in improving the "social capital" of neighborhoods to support learning. Thus, both the professional "services" of a Hull-House tradition and the community involvement and even "empowerment" of an Ocean Hill tradition are being actively reviewed in many settings today as an introduction into a new brand of "reform" in public education.

Neither the tensions between nor the differing implications of these two strands have been fully worked out. One strand, settlement-house-like, places an emphasis upon a concerted (and hopefully coordinated) extension of professional services to communities—through connections with the omnipresent institution of the public school. Indeed, the development of school-based or school-linked coordinated children's and family services programs (as "full-service schooling") has achieved widespread attention and experimentation in the United States (Dryfoos, 1994). The other strand, oriented toward community empowerment, places greater emphasis upon grassroots' efforts to re-establish the larger communal and economic vitality of poor neighborhoods. They seek to strengthen the self-help capacities of individual families by simultaneously developing and strengthening local supports and institutions (Judd & Parkinson, 1990; Garr, 1995).

The two strands need not be at odds. Indeed, Deborah Cohen (1995: 35) observes that, "only by working together can schools and communities hope to salvage young lives and fulfill education's promise of literacy and opportunity." Nevertheless, the two approaches can present quite different options in regard to the relationships between schools and their communities, and quite different implications for educational reform. These differing community-development strategies (or "strands") have been only minimally examined comparatively to date; thus, the intent of this chapter is to begin such a comparative discussion, in the hope of gaining added insights into the community context of improved urban schooling.

Coordinated Children's Services and the School-Site

In a significant broadening of the mission of the public school, the notion of an array of coordinated, non-educational children's and family services has captured widespread interest across America. The central concept is by no means new. Precedents can be found in the Gary Plan of Willard Wirt, in Progressive-era forays by the schools into medical exams and inoculations, in the long-term support of community schooling by Michigan's Mott Foundation, and in a still-lingering residue of many state and local initiatives from the "Great Society" thinking of the 1960's (Tyack, 1992).

Nevertheless, the current expansion of coordinated-services experimentation across the United States is unprecedented. Fortuitously, the movement has coincided with a new appreciation and understanding of the learning potential in positive school-community connections (Crowson & Boyd, 1993; Rigsby, Reynolds, & Wang, 1995; Yinger & Borman, 1994; Weiss, 1995). In what Goodlad (1987) has labeled "the new ecology of schooling," many today recognize that school, family, and community are vitally interdependent and that the development and learning of children depend heavily upon many supports available to them in their environments (Comer, 1980). Enhancing parental involvement in the learning process, collaboration and "sharing" between families and educators, and much greater attentiveness to the home on the part of educators—are all elements of this new sense of school-community learning connections (Epstein, 1988, 1990). These, along with an array of other supports and services (e.g., health and recreation services, good housing, economic development, libraries), can ideally form "a network of learning environments" (Fantini, 1983).

Coordinated services initiatives have also coincided with growing concerns about the wide disparities in the "social capital" available to children from one family and community to another (Coleman, 1987, 1994). As defined by James S. Coleman (1987: 36), social capital encompasses "the norms, the social networks, and the relationships between adults and children that are of value for the child's growing up." Although long aware that the strengths of the home are also strengths in children's learning, many now appreciate that it behooves the schools to seek to reach out, and indeed to "invest" in

the very creation of strength (social capital) in their community environments. As Coleman (1994: 31) put it:

> Now, confronting newly fragile families and weakened communities, schools find their task to be a different one: to function in a way that strengthens communities and builds parental involvement with children. The school's very capacity to educate children depends upon the fulfillment of this task.

From early on, a key assumption of the coordinated services movement has been that the multiple needs of children and families require a serious effort to somehow link the often disconnected services into a coherent "whole." The long-standing fragmentation of services to children and families has damaged their effectiveness (Kirst and Kelley, 1995). Multiple needs cannot be well addressed in a piecemeal fashion, so reformers believe that the differing service frameworks and their specialized professionals must be coordinated to benefit at-risk children and families. This effort to coordinate, to integrate, or to achieve collaboration among disparate services has been the prime focus of attention in the services movement to date—far beyond any focusing upon school-community connections or the development of social capital. However, despite major foundation funding and assistance from a number of well-crafted handbooks for practitioners, evidence of successful service-coordination is still limited (White & Wehlage, 1995).

Repeatedly, researchers have found that the main barriers to success lie in substantial political and organizational constraints surrounding service-coordination efforts. Differing professional cultures and incentive systems are thrown together; a sharing of information about a service-receiving clientele is to replace professionally-valued autonomy; space and "turf" must be renegotiated; categorical funding is to be redirected toward commingling; the separate "needs" of children and families (e.g., education, health, welfare) are now to be reoriented toward the "whole;" and administrative visions of what the school is "all about" are to be significantly expanded (Crowson & Boyd, 1993, 1996; Smrekar, 1996). Additional constraints derive from the short-term, foundation-sponsored funding of much experimentation to date, from the limited consensus as to just what government should do for children and families in need, and from a public mood nationally that appears, at this writing, to be far more interested in a contraction rather than an expansion of government (Cibulka, 1996; Smrekar, 1996).

Interestingly, the coordinated-services movement has coincided with, and has even contributed to, a renewal of scholarly attention to the "deep structures" of organizational change. What better opportunity to open organizations to scrutiny than to study them under a microscope of "cooperation"? Accordingly, instructive research has inquired into such "structural issues" as the deep differences in the professional cultures of varying service-providers, the differing "conventions" and "ordering" of services across human-service organizations, the historical "baggage" that institutional players bring separately to the service-coordination effort, and the close linkages and, at the same time, the discontinuities between systems of professional training and the demands of coordination (Crowson & Boyd, 1996; Tyack, 1992; Adler & Gardner, 1994; Knapp & Ferguson, 1995).

Nevertheless, despite the important windows that have been opened into organizational and institutional behaviors, it is increasingly apparent that the "coordinated" aspect of the services movement may not be the most important of its elements. More significant are the implications of the community services effort for a reexamination of some key aspects of the school reform movement, writ large.

Indeed, the services phenomenon helps to identify some important "watershed" considerations, regarding the school-community relations aspect of educational reform, and at a time when popular acceptance and the very "legitimacy" of public education in the U.S. may be in substantial decline (Crowson, Boyd, and Mawhinney, 1996). The family and children's services idea re-opens a long, unresolved debate about the separate roles of parents and professionals, the roles of professionals other than educators in children's development, the roles of the lay citizenry in school programs and governance, and even the overall institutional role of the school in relation to the modern welfare state (Cibulka, 1996). All of this occur at a moment when such notions as home-schooling, voucher-style parental choice, the "break-up" of school districts, mayoral and state "takeovers" of city schools, and charter schools ("opting-out," U.S. style) appear to be introducing a far more radical set of solutions to a movement that until recently was content simply to "restructure."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It remains to be seen whether the coordinated services movement will manage to establish "staying power" among the array of strategies for educational reform. Our contention, in agreement with White and Wehlage (1995), is that the test for community services is less its success in coordinating resources and agencies than it is in reshaping the priorities and practices of schools—toward a closer understanding of, and even partnership with, the families and clientele to be served. Furthermore, the test for community services may be less its case-by-case distribution of added assistance to individual families and children than its capacity for "fostering networks of interdependency within and among families, neighborhoods, and the larger community"—that is, in firmly re-establishing the learning-connection and in building social capital (White & Wehlage, 1995: 35).

Community Development and the School-Site

The local school is seen by many as the logical and indeed best situated place of deployment for human-services-oriented community outreach. However, there are observers who argue that our beleaguered and much-criticized schools should not be burdened with these additional duties. Some critics continue to raise questions about the appropriateness and legitimacy of "social roles" for the schools beyond the 3R's. The schools and their teachers, they claim, should be left alone to teach.

Other critics see the local school as a very poor choice for leadership in community-development—for schools, especially in big cities, simply do not have a very glorious history of "openness" to its families and its neighborhood. Finally, critics note that the central notion of school-linked or school-based "services" outreach to the community fails to address appropriately the more deep-seated problems of urban development. Many of these critics urge a more focused attention to broader, neighborhood-revitalization strategies, tackling economic and empowerment issues as a first priority with spill-over into, but less direct dependence upon the schools (Cohen, 1995).

The community-development (or neighborhood revitalization) strategy draws much of its strength from a larger conception of the problem than that which typically animates the coordinated services movement. The notion of the neighborhood as an embedded reflection of leadership and regeneration/renewal citywide is a key concept (Judd & Parkinson, 1990; Gittell, 1992). A parallel idea, offered by Weeres & Kerchner (1996), goes well beyond the local school and its array of "services" to a picture of public education as a fundamental "basic industry" of the city. Schools, as much as other institutions, help to develop cities—and help to serve as agencies of each city's civic and economic growth.

The community development perspective also offers a further and deeper broadening of understandings of child development. Closely linked to the notion of "social capital," a child-development flavor to the coordinated services movement has been reflected in the clear recognition that "care" (e.g., health care, social services) and education must go hand in hand developmentally (Comer, 1980, 1984, 1988). The neighborhood-revitalization recognition, however, is that a child's development is also critically

affected by "larger" community conditions and investments—in housing quality, parks and recreation opportunities, employment and training, law enforcement, etc. (Haveman & Wolfe, 1994). Sadly, the typical size of the public investment in a child-development infrastructure in inner-city neighborhoods falls far short of comparable investments in suburbia (Littell & Wynn, 1989).

There is a grassroots' activism about much of the neighborhood-revitalization movement that has yet to penetrate deeply into coordinated services experimentation. The language of "empowerment," enterprise, self-reliance, "indigenous leadership," entrepreneurialism, mobilization, and "restoration" is to be found throughout discussions of community development (Garr, 1995). However, this is not typically the language of professional social-services providers, including educators, who are likely to find more comfort in a discussion of "meeting needs" than of "enterprise." Additionally, such institutions as neighborhood churches, local banks, welfare rights groups, citizens' action councils, food banks, and community youth centers have been much more likely to date to be cooperating "players" in revitalization than in service coordination.

In the United States, the community revitalization approach has received much of its current impetus from the July, 1995 publication of President Clinton's National Urban Policy Report. Entitled "Empowerment: A New Covenant with America's Communities," this report offers a "Community Empowerment Agenda". This report focuses on family self-sufficiency and independence through employment, a renewed encouragement of private investment in urban communities, and a locally or "grassroots" driven strategy of action.

For the most severely distressed of the nation's urban communities, an Empowerment Zones (EZ) and Enterprise Communities (EC) Program is to generate "strategies for change that combine innovative economic development initiatives with essential human capital and community building investments" (U.S. Department of Housing, 1995: 44). In the EZ/EC program, the heaviest stress is upon a transition into employment, job-training, private-public partnerships in the stimulation of economic activity, and such quality-of-life improvements as better housing and anti-crime initiatives. The focus is also heavily upon

self-determination rather than governmental largesse. At the same time, consolidated services efforts are not ruled out in the President's Report; indeed, integrated human services which link health, education, family assistance, and job training are specifically mentioned and encouraged.

The idea of an "enterprise zone" (EZ) is generally credited to a 1978 speech by Sir Geoffrey Howe, a member of the British House of Commons (Butler, 1991). From the start, the focus has been upon the economic improvement of poor neighborhoods through strengthening of indigenous community institutions, through investment incentives and the encouragement of public-private partnerships, and through a preference for market forces above governmental intervention (Green, 1991).

The low-regulation block grant and bottom-up strategies of the enterprise zone concept have considerable appeal—in contrast with the earlier, over-federalized methods of the Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) Program for inner-city economic development (Watson, Heilman, & Montjoy, 1994). Nevertheless, many unresolved questions remain about the combination of public and private roles in neighborhood revitalization. As Green and Brintnall (1994) note, little private investment is now found in many distressed communities, and most of the key resources in the lives of community residents continue to derive from public sources—e.g., transfer payments, public education, police protection, public health, public transportation.

Indeed, supporters of focusing upon the schools in community-family connection initiatives point to the omnipresence of the local school as a significant element. The public school is one of the last, ongoing and stable institutions remaining in many distressed neighborhoods. It is an institution of substance, with a modest, if constrained tradition of its own in the game of "development." From the revitalization perspective, however, community development (through investment and "enterprise") has thus far not matched at all well with the work of the public school—even when the school begins to work hard towards "outreach" and "services" beyond the narrowly educational. Furthermore, neither the "social capital" nor the "empowerment" implications of both strategies have been well analyzed comparatively. Consequently, for all intents and purposes, to date the local school-site has been left out of the EZ/EC innovation.

Coordinated Services, Enterprise Zones, and School Reform

With delightful imagery, Tyack and Hansot (1982) have observed that it was not by accident that our earliest, one-room schools resembled churches, complete with steeple-like bell towers. The local schoolhouse was in the very middle of the educational, social, political, and even religious life of its neighborhood. From Fourth of July picnics, to weekly spelling bees, to the occasional revival—the community was schoolhouse centered, and in turn, the schoolhouse molded itself around the lives and values of its community.

Arguably, the more modern legacy in public education, over the past fifty years, has been a thrust toward a bit of "disconnection" between schools and their communities (Crowson, 1992). The need to preserve strong norms of professional discretion against private-regarding parents and narrow-minded communities was a theme as early as 1932, in the work of Willard Waller. Generations of school administrators in the U.S. have been trained around the dangers of losing managerial control to the "politics" of their communities (Iannaccone, 1989). Curiously, while parental involvement has been long recognized as essential to successful learning for children, this recognition has not translated into a full "partnership" with the school (Sarason, 1995). Similarly, thoughts of closer relationships with parents and with the local community in the governance of schools have long encountered a "system" of governance that emphasizes "top-down" rather than "bottom-up" decision-making (Mann, 1986).

Amidst a wide-ranging agenda for reforming American education—from choice to "standards," to charter schooling, to site-based management—attempts to reverse the "disconnections" strategy are just beginning to gather momentum. Interestingly, while the staying power of the coordinated-services idea may be in question,[1] the goal of re-connecting schools to their communities appears to be increasing in appeal. The plight of the American family is a major consideration; a new and widespread interest generally in the power of "community" is involved; decentralization to the grassroots in America continues to receive

[1] A major blow to the coordinated children's services notion occurred in mid-1994, with an announcement by the Pew Charitable Trust that it was terminating its commitment to the development of school-linked family centers. Pew had been a major philanthropic player in the movement (Cohen, 1994).

attention; the parent as a key figure in learning is now more fully respected; and, with or without coordination, the public school as a service-rich institution continues to be an appealing notions.

What is to be learned from the two very different strategies for community regeneration we have discussed—about educational reform that will reconnect schools and communities, about the options and possibilities for community-oriented changes in public schooling, and about the potential gains and losses from one approach or another? We offer three observations.

First, whether "family strategies" are to be focused upon services, opportunities for employment, empowerment or all three, the public school must now consider itself an integral part of the full-scale development (economic, social, human-capital, and pedagogical) requirements of its community. More than service, the relationship under reform involves forms of support—from the institution of the school to the remainder of a network of both public and private "investors." The most important consequence of reform could be to fundamentally alter the direction of interaction between schools and their neighborhood environments. In terms used by Gary Wehlage et al. (1989), the newly reformed role for the schools would be its activation as a "community of support" for the families and children in its orbit.

"Support" is a term long used by educators to describe the responsibilities of parents and of the community (particularly financial support) if the schools are "to do their jobs" effectively. Non-supportive parents and an inadequately supportive community are among the most common of teacher and administrator complaints. Seldom, however, has the profession adequately addressed "the other side" of a support coin—that is, the degree to which the school can be credited with and held responsible for its support of the home and the larger community.

An extended role for the school, in full support of those in its environment (as well as supported by its environment) touches upon and potentially alters some deeply rooted structural features in public education. At a theoretical level, the notion of the school as an exercise in supportive "outreach" to its community connects with the idea of building "social capital," as noted earlier. It also finds strength in a

new sense of the school as a central source of its own brand of societal "investment" in families, communities, and in the development of children (Hawley, 1990; Kagan, 1989, 1993).

An initial implication, clearly delineated by Cibulka (1996), is that community re-connection through "outreach" suggests a fundamental reshaping of public schooling—toward the full balancing of both academic *and* social/economic objectives. Far beyond the tentative and somewhat peripheral add-ons of lunches, breakfasts, and nurses, the "full-service school" (as one strategy) envisions a thoroughly changed institution—one that places the public school in a pivotal position in a much-reshaped welfare state (Dryfoos, 1994). The evidence thus far, in investigations into coordinated services ventures, is that professional educators have experienced considerable difficulty in "getting their heads around" such a transformed institutional role (Smylie, Crowson, Chou, & Levin, 1994).

However, there are other options. The local school could maintain its 3R's emphasis but cooperate extensively with community-development agencies and other centers of family services. The local school can also be a fully active partner in a developmentally oriented network of public/private community institutions (from banks, to churches, to employers, to "activists"). To date, educators have only minimally understood that they too are part of an "enterprise"—despite the saliency of the school-to-work transition, the school's own role as an employer and purchaser of goods/services, the "products" even the most narrowly-defined school contributes to its community (e.g., lunches, health examinations, school age day-care), and the school's accumulation of professionally credentialed "social capital."

Second, "empowerment" has been much more clearly recognized in the shaping of enterprise and development strategies than in coordinated-services planning. This is not hard to understand. A provision of added professional services to families and communities can very easily proceed (and usually does) with only minimal involvement of the "client" in decision processes. Most of the key issues in service coordination (e.g., questions of professional turf, control of/confidentiality in client information, overcoming fragmented rules/regulations structures, resource-commingling restrictions) are issues of traditional *professions-dominated* service delivery (Crowson & Boyd, 1993). The struggle between

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

professionals-know-best (for the good of the client) and the client-knows-best (for his or her own good) constitutes an unresolved battle of values, with deep roots historically in the progressive-era origins of the family-services and school-outreach constructs.

In development-language terms, there has been a cost to this approach. Much of the focus in the children's-services movement has been upon the *supply* of added services to a presumably needy community. Much less attention has been paid to the community's *demand* for assistance. From the *supply* side, an array of new options for assistance, added professional expertise, and often some connecting personnel (e.g., family advocates) are made available to a targeted clientele. From the *demand* side, the new service offerings may be somewhat less important than a sense of welcome, a partnership in "development," a celebration of "community," a sense of need from the clients' perspectives, and a communication to families that they are not problems to be "fixed," so much as they are shareholders with the school and its professionals.

From a very similar perspective, White and Wehlage (1995: 29) concluded from their examination of the "New Futures" initiatives in collaborative services—that one key impediment to success was "the disjuncture between a specific collaborative policy and the actual social conditions affecting at-risk youth." "Disjuncture," they wrote, "describes bad policy, usually the result of inadequate and inaccurate knowledge about conditions in the communities being served."

The New Futures experimentation began in 1988, in five selected cities in the U.S., with funding from the Annie E. Casey Foundation. White and Wehlage (1995: 23) have described it as "one of the earliest and most ambitious attempts to bring about community collaboration." In some concluding remarks, following their evaluation of New Futures, they noted that this experimentation "failed to find ways to involve members of targeted communities in solving their own problems" (White & Wehlage, 1995: 36). Furthermore, they contend that the "major issue [in collaboration] is how to get whole communities, the *haves* and the *have-nots*, to engage in the difficult task of community development" (White & Wehlage, 1995: 37).

The meaningful participation of the client in human services is a theme that has bedeviled community-development initiatives through much of this century. From "urban renewal" strategies of the 1950's, which ignored the clientele; to politicization accompanying "maximum feasible participation" requirements in the 1960's; to the Model Cities and Community Development Corporation initiatives of more recent times—the issue of participation (let alone empowerment) has remained largely unresolved. Indeed, the very image of parents and community residents as the "clients" of professionals (who, moreover, may view many as dependent and even pathological "cases") severely limits participatory options. On the other hand, to assume that lay participation (e.g., in policy setting) will automatically improve the need-relevancy of services or even change institutional values—is to assume most naively. Robert Halpern (1995: 178) warns that to make participation (and eventually empowerment) work requires very careful anticipation and planning—around "a clear, multi-step process, with rules, parameters and objectives jointly set by community members and professionals, and a trust in that process among all the stakeholders."

Third, school-based coordinated services to children and families may have limited effects without the assistance of some community-wide revitalization and empowerment. On the other hand, however, enterprise zone and economic development strategies may be seriously weakened if there is no effective liaison with the public schools. Cohen (1995: 36) has observed that the schools "have seldom played more than a bit part" thus far in most neighborhood-revitalization. Consequently, most of the broad-based efforts toward community development seem to be unaccompanied by any significant change in the schools (Cohen, 1995).

To be sure, advocates of community revitalization clearly recognize that the local schools must be central players. Indeed, in federal grant-approval for education, attention is steadily increasing to needs for additional technology allocations, programming incentives (e.g., priority funding for the gifted, bilingual education, parent-training, etc.), and the encouragement of community programs/services (including service integration) within designated "empowerment zones" (Cohen, 1996). The school-to-work transition, job-

readiness training, skills training, courses in entrepreneurship and individual self-sufficiency, after-school programs, and an array of opportunities for family counseling—are among the further ingredients in economic-development and empowerment-zone funding to date (Cohen, 1996).

Nevertheless, the emerging notion that neighborhood initiatives should proceed broadly and holistically, on many fronts simultaneously (e.g., education and human services plus job-creation, community development, and community safety, as well as improved physical surroundings), encounters an organizational environment in which little thought has been given to just how thoroughly and deeply institutional reform may be necessary, if community regeneration is to occur. As one "deep-structure" example, Skocpol (1992) observed that the public schools have been far more comfortable historically with a "maternal" focus upon children, parent-partnerships, and caring homes than upon the economic well-being of the community. On the other hand, those who have espoused improvements over the years—in such arenas as housing quality, crime prevention, resident participation and empowerment, job-creation, and neighborhood "clean-up"—have tended to neglect the regenerative power of the "maternal", of especially committed and caring individuals ("wizards," says McLaughlin), of whom public education historically has had aplenty (McLaughlin, Irby, & Langman, 1994; Halpern, 1995). Many other deeply embedded differences between the institutions serving communities can be found in traditions of bureaucratic control, professional ideologies and training, attitudes toward client and community, reputations for neighborhood responsiveness, and historical patterns of racial/ethnic exclusion.

Of even greater and, indeed, critical significance is the fact that the very logic of family and neighborhood assistance has changed dramatically over the course of this century (Halpern, 1995). Historically, neighborhood institutions such as settlement houses and the local school helped to prepare residents for entry into the nation's economic and social mainstream. For many—particularly poor, minority Americans—however, urban neighborhoods have now become not way stations but end-points, with little realistic chance of a fulfilled journey into the mainstream (Halpern, 1995: 224; Wilson, 1987, 1996). Tightly aligned with the old notion of "preparation" (for the mainstream), the public schools have

experienced difficulty in attempting to redefine themselves (in a recognition of urban realities) toward a more "full-service" orientation, offering "outreach," family assistance, and "social capital" in the support of improved children's learning (Smylie, Crowson, Chou, & Levin, 1994).

Yet to be explored at all, to date, in educational reform is the potentially even more difficult transition of the public school, under EZ/EC initiatives, from a "full-service school" into an "enterprise school."[2] An enterprise school might be expected to join an array of other neighborhood and city institutions in a much-larger-than-services and a more-substantive-than-preparation participation in the development and regeneration of the school's own neighborhood environment. Services to children and families would be provided, to be sure, but far more fulsome, well-planned relationships may also be necessary with neighborhood churches, businesses, community organizers, housing authorities, the parks department, the police, youth organizations, and the city-at-large.

---

[2] Our thanks for this insight to our colleague at Vanderbilt University, James Guthrie.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Conclusion

Extending social organization and bringing "order" to distressed neighborhoods, along with providing hope and "preparation," constitute a role for service organizations with deep roots in turn-of-the-century America. The rediscovery of such a service and outreach role for the public school, not unlike the work of the settlement house, has now become a reform motif in the U.S. of considerable power and appeal. A "full-service school," linking education and an array of other supports (e.g., health services; counseling; family advocacy; employment, housing, and welfare assistance) can contribute to the development of much of the "social capital" needed to improve children's learning. There is more than a bit of "professionals know best" to all of this; thus, a key constraint has been how to involve the "clients" meaningfully in the coordinated-services relationship.

While a laudable concept, the full-service school conflicts with many twentieth-century traditions of bureaucratization, professional distancing, fragmented and "categorical" programming and, as noted earlier, often only a very tentative partnering between educators and families/communities. Coordinated children's services initiatives are fairly widespread now, not only in the United States but also in other nations. However, the results in the U.S. thus far have been mixed—with evidence that the changes in educational lifeways promised by the concept of full-service schooling threaten many deeply embedded "institutionalized" features of American schooling (Crowson & Boyd, 1993). The "test" for coordinated services, observe White and Wehlage (1995: 35), is in "reshaping the priorities and practices of schools." That is an extremely tall order.

Even more demanding, however, is the newer suggestion for reform—that, where needed, the public schools should now play an active (and even more complex and socially involved) role in the empowerment and economic revitalization of their communities. Important assumptions here are the notions that: (a) added assistance to families and children, while vital, can fail to payoff if the full involvement of parents and the community is not a simultaneous goal; (b) the local school should be recognized as very much a part of the "basic industry" of the city, with economic and community-

development responsibilities that go well beyond a mere "delivery" of services (Weeres & Kerchner, 1996); and, (c) powerful neighborhood revitalization strategies should proceed from the realization that in poor neighborhoods "physical, economic, and social, individual and collective, adult and child well-being are all interconnected" (Halpern, 1995: 198). Thus, as noted above, this logic argues that, rather than just "full-service schools," local public schools should be transformed into "enterprise schools."

Just what does this mean for practical school reform and policy? Altering schools, even on their own terms, is notoriously difficult; reorienting them toward a community services outreach extending well beyond their traditional activities is still more challenging. The added issues to be addressed in a transition toward "enterprise schools" in urban neighborhoods will be major—going well beyond localized foci upon the "developmental" needs of children and families that have usually been the aim of coordinated-services efforts. Partnering with revitalization forces (as well as family "welfare" forces) in a neighborhood might mean tackling such issues as: economic incentives; employment options and training; a neighborhood's attractiveness to investment capital; and partnering with such "economic" institutions as banks, retail businesses, insurers, and property owners—those persons whom educators tend to regard as "just-out-to-make-money." To accomplish such goals will take a serious rethinking of school, community, and family connections, as James Cibulka (1996: 429) concludes, along with a "transformation" (not just reform) of the schools, and "a new approach to the welfare state."

In evocative language, Claire Smrekar (1996: 31) reaches a similar conclusion, asserting that the new economic revitalization and empowerment press in urban education should:

> . . . force us to penetrate the veneer that has helped slide the issue of children's services to the center of the policy table on the naive and narrow assumption that integrated services will provide more economic and efficient systems for families.
> Our responses require us to move beyond the erratic and irregular child-saving impulses that have marked earlier actions, to efforts that understand the complexity of the lives of children and their families . . .

In the final analysis, the issue seems to come down to a question of how to meld together aspects of the two competing strategies—professional coordinated services and community development or empowerment—into workable approaches for schools in partnership with parents, community

organizations, and other agencies. Each approach, in isolation from the other, appears likely to produce only limited success. Yet, merging the two approaches presents daunting problems. Community empowerment approaches are inclined to become highly politicized (Alinsky, 1971) and conflict strongly with professional and bureaucratic norms and procedures. Professional services approaches are inclined to be disconnected from, and sometimes disrespectful of, parental and community preferences and values. At the same time, some believe that going very far in either direction will all too easily divert schools from their central and most important function—basic academic instruction (Committee for Economic Development, 1994). Moreover, economic trends toward the "disappearance" of work opportunities, which are most acute in depressed inner cities, conflict with the aspirations of community development approaches (Rifkin, 1995; Wilson, 1996).

What then is to be done? We believe the best answer is to encourage experimentation, especially in ventures led by entrepreneurial educators who are willing to take the risks to try to create "enterprise" schools. To foster this sort of experimentation, we need local, state, and national policies that will support and provide incentives for this kind of bold activity. That this kind of school can be created, with the right kind of dynamic leadership, has been proven by the well-publicized and dramatic success of Yvonne Chan in transforming the Vaughn Street School in Los Angeles, which serves a disadvantaged Hispanic population (Freedman, 1995). School principals like Chan have been rare in pubic education, but it is also true that we only recently have begun to encourage this kind of leadership through such means as the creation of "charter schools," which is one of the mechanisms Chan used to transform her school. Clearly, "business as usual" cannot get the job done.[3] We believe that a variety of experiments is needed, to explore the potential of enterprise schools and of alternative approaches to the melding of the two strategies discussed in this chapter.

---

[3] The truth is that the norms and incentives of "business as usual" in large urban public school districts militate strongly against entrepreneurial behavior and instead reward school principals for "playing it safe" and "going by the book."

References

Adler, L., & Gardner, S. (Eds.). (1994). *The politics of linking schools and social services*. Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Alinsky, S. D. (1971). *Rules for radicals: A practical primer for realistic radicals*. New York: Random House.

Butler, S. M. (1991). The conceptual evolution of enterprise zones. In R. E. Green (Ed.), *Enterprise zones: New directions in economic development*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 27-40.

Cibulka, J. (1996). Conclusion: toward an interpretation of school, family, and community connections: Policy challenges. In J. Cibulka and W. J. Kritek (Eds.), *Coordination among schools, families and communities: Prospects for educational reform*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 403-435.

Cohen, D. L. (1996, May 1). In the zone: Effort aims to link economic gains, school reform. *Education Week, 15*(32), 1, 8-9.

Cohen, D. L. (1995, May 3). Joining hands. *Education Week*, 35-38.

Cohen, D. L. (1994, June 1). Demise of Pew project offers lessons to funders. *Education Week, 13*(36), 1, 9.

Coleman, J. S. (1994). Parental involvement: Implications for schools. In R. J. Yinger and K. M. Borman (Eds.), *Restructuring education: Issues and strategies for communities, schools, and universities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc., pp. 19-31.

Coleman, J. S. (1987). Families and schools. *Educational Researcher, 16*(6), 32-38.

Comer, J. P. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American, 259*(5), 42-48.

Comer, J. P. (1984, May). Home-school relationships as they affect the academic success of children. *Education and Urban Society, 16*, 323-337.

Comer, J. P. (1980). *School power: Implications of an intervention project*. New York: Free Press.

Committee for Economic Development (1994). *Putting learning first: Governing and managing the schools for high achievement*. New York: Author.

Crowson, R. L. (1992). *School-community relations, under reform*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1996, June). Achieving coordinated school-linked services: Facilitating utilization of the emerging knowledge base. *Educational Policy, 10*, 2, 253-272.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1996). Structures and strategies: Toward an understanding of alternative models for coordinated children's services. In J. Cibulka and W. J. Kritek (Eds.), *Coordination among schools, families and communities: Prospects for educational reform*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press, pp. 137-169.

Crowson, R. L., & Boyd, W. L. (1993, February). Coordinated services for children: Designing arks for storms and seas unknown. *American Journal of Education, 101*(2), 140-179.

Crowson, R. L., Boyd, W. L., & Mawhinney, H. (Eds.). (1996). The politics of education and the new institutionalism: Reinventing the American school. *The 1995 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association*. London: Falmer Press.

Dryfoos, J. (1994). *Full-service schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Epstein, J. (1990). School and family connections: Theory, research, and implications for integrating sociologies of education and family. *Marriage and Family Review, 15*(1), 99-126.

Epstein, J. (1988). *Parent involvement*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Elementary and Middle Schools.

Fantini, M. D. (1983). From school system to educative system: Linking the school with community environments. In R. L. Sinclair (Ed.), *For every school a community: Expanding environments for learning*. Boston: Institute for Responsive Education.

Freedman, J. (1995). *The charter school idea: Breaking educational gridlock*. Red Deer, Alberta, Canada: Society for Advancing Educational Research.

Garr, R. (1995). *Reinvesting in America*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gittell, R. (1992). *Renewing cities*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Goodlad, J. I. (Ed.). (1987). *The ecology of school renewal*. Eighty-ninth yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Green, R. E. (Ed.). (1991). *Enterprise zones: New directions in economic development*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Green, R. E., & Brintnall, M. (1994). Conclusions and lessons learned. In R. E. Green (Ed.), *Enterprise zones: New directions in economic development*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications, pp. 241-257.

Halpern, R. (1995), *Rebuilding the inner city: A history of neighborhood initiatives to address poverty in the United States*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Haveman, R., & Wolfe, B. (1994). *Succeeding generations: On the effects of investments in children*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Hawley, W. D. (1990). Missing pieces of the educational reform agenda: Or, why the first and second waves may miss the boat. In S. B. Bacharach (Ed.), *Educational reform: Making sense of it all*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, pp. 213-233.

Iannaccone, L. (1989). Foreword. In F. W. Lutz & G. Merz (Eds.), *The politics of school/community relations*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, pp. xi-xiv.

Judd, D., & Parkinson, M. (Eds.). (1990). *Leadership and urban regeneration*. Newberry Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Kagan, S. L., & Neville, P. R. (1993). *Integrating services for children and families*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kirst, M. W., & Kelley, C. (1995), Collaboration to improve education and children's services. In L. C. Rigsby, M. C. Reynolds, & M. C. Wang (Eds.), *School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, pp. 21-43.

Knapp, M. S., & Ferguson, M. (1995). Integrated services Reforms and the front-line professional. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA). Salt Lake City, UT.

LaNoue, G. R., & Smith, B. L. R. (1973). *The politics of school decentralization*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Littell, J., & Wynn, J. (1989). *The availability and use of community resources for young adolescents in an inner-city and a suburban community*. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chapin Hall Center for Children.

Mann, D. (1986). *The politics of administrative representation*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

McLaughlin, M. W., Irby, M. I., & Langman, J. (1994). *Urban sanctuaries: Inner-city youth and neighborhood organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Philpott, T. L. (1978). *The slum and the ghetto: Neighborhood deterioration and middle-class reform, Chicago 1880-1930*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Rifkin, J. (1995). *The end of work: The decline of the global labor force and the dawn of the post-market era*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam.

Rigsby, L. C., Reynolds, M. C., & Wang, M. C. (Eds.). (1995). *School-community connections: Exploring issues for research and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sarason, S. B. (1995). *Parental involvement and the political principle*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Skocpol, T. (1992), *Protecting soldiers and mothers*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Smrekar, C. (1996). *The organizational and political threats to school-linked integrated services*. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Educational Leadership, Peabody College, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Smylie, M. A., Crowson, R. L., Chou, V., & Levin, R. (1994). The principal and community-school connections in Chicago's radical reform. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 30*(3), 342-364.

Tyack, D. (1992, Spring). Health and social services in public schools: Historical perspectives. *Future of Children, 2*, 19-31.

Tyack, D., & Hansot, H. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1820-1980*. New York: Basic Books.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. (1995). *Empowerment, a new covenant with America's communities: President Clinton's national urban policy report*. Washington, D.C.

Waller, W. (1932). *The sociology of teaching*. New York: Wiley.

Watson, D. J., Heilman, J. G., & Montjoy, R. S. (1994). *The politics of redistributing urban aid*. Westport, CN: Praeger.

Weeres, J. G., & Kerchner, C. T. (1996). This time it's serious: Post-industrialism and the coming of institutional change in education. In R. L. Crowson, W. L. Boyd, & H. B. Mawhinney (Eds.), *The politics of education and the new institutionalism: Reinventing the American school*. London: Falmer Press, pp. 135-152.

Wehlage, G. G., Rutter, R. A., Smith, G. A., Lesko, N., & Fernandez, R. R. (1989). *Reducing the risk: Schools as communities of support*. London: Falmer Press.

Weiss, H. B. (1995). *Raising our future: Families, schools, and communities joining together. A report*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education.

White, J. A., & Wehlage, G. (1995). Community collaboration: If it is such a good idea, why is it so hard to do? *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 17*(1), 23-38.

Wilson, W. J. (1996). *When work disappears: The world of the new urban poor*. New York, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Wilson, W. J. (1987). *The truly disadvantaged, the inner city, the underclass, and public policy*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Yinger, R. J., & Borman, K. M. (Eds.). (1994). *Restructuring education: Issues and strategies for communities, schools, and universities*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, Inc.